

REMARKS

Claims 18-20 and 22 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Antonucci (US 5,927,772). Claims 1, 3, 7-15 and 21 stand rejected under 25 USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Antonucci when read with Detweiler (US 5,076,622).

Claims 1, 16 and 22 stand objected to for informalities recited by the Examiner.

Claims 11 and 13 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim and would be allowable if rewritten into independent form.

The Examiner has remarked that the prior art does not teach or render the applicant's combination including a spring positioned inboard of the locking member collar and operating against the solenoid from which the locking member extends to bias the locking member to extend outwardly from the solenoid.

Applicant asserts that the limitation of a collar or limitation of positioning said spring inboard position of a locking collar is not necessary in combination with the applicant's other limitations to distinguish over the cited art.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 16 and 22 consistent with the Examiner's remarks to overcome the informalities objection. Claim 11 has been cancelled and its limitation carried forward into claim 1. The limitation of claim 10 was not carried into claim 1 as it is not considered necessary to distinguish over the cited prior art. (Claim 11 had previously depended from claims 1 and 10).

In addition to the distinguishing spring structure, above-recited as being addressed by the Examiner, applicant asserts that the lateral tabs shown a element 98 are not taught nor suggested by the prior art. Moreover, one of ordinary skill would not consider adding this tab structure to Antonucci nor to Detweiler because there would be no function for it in either of those designs, and also there is no suggestion that such an addition could be beneficial to either of those two prior art structures. This tab structure, in of itself in combination with

Best Available Copy

applicant's other structure, distinguishes over the cited prior art. Applicant has amended claim 22 to include this limitation and to distinguish over the cited art.

Claim 16 has been amended to recite the distinguishing spring structure and is likewise considered now to distinguish the present invention over the cited prior art.

Claims 2, 4, 5, and 6 were previously withdrawn upon a requirement for restriction and election made by the applicant. As claims 1, 16, and 22 are now believed to be allowable, applicant requests that claims 2, 4, 5, and 6 be reinstated in the application.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1. Claims 4, 5, and 6 have been amended to depend from claim 22.

It is requested that the above-cited application be re-examined as to the claims amended herein and passed to issue with those claims.

Respectfully submitted,
Paul & Paul

Date: Sept 13, 2004

by: John J. Simkanich
Regis No. 26, 036
2900 Two Thousand Market Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215)568-4900
FAX 215-567-5057

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent Office, to Examiner Carlos Lopez, in Art Unit 3676, at Fax number 703-872-8306, on the date identified below.

on Sept 13, 2004
(Date)

PAUL & PAUL

by: John J. Simkanich

Best Available Copy